



Guidance for Periodic Programme Review

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Author: | Academic Registry |
| Date created: | April 2017 |
| Date updated: | August 2020 |
| Date for review: | July 2021 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Glossary | 4 |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 5 |
| Chapter 2: Periodic Programme Review – initial stages | 7 |
| TIMESCALES FOR PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW..... | 7 |
| INITIATING PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW..... | 7 |
| Chapter 3: The Periodic Programme Review Planning Process | 9 |
| Chapter 4: Periodic Programme Review Documentation | 10 |
| SELF EVALUATION DOCUMENT | 10 |
| PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION..... | 11 |
| MODULE PROFORMAS | 11 |
| STAFF CVs..... | 12 |
| Chapter 5: Student Engagement in the Periodic Programme Review Process | 13 |
| STUDENT INPUT DURING DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF-EVALUATION..... | 13 |
| STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AT THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW EVENT OR VIA THE DESK-BASED/HYBRID MODEL OF REVIEW | 14 |
| APPOINTING A STUDENT TO ACT AS A FULL PANEL MEMBER..... | 14 |
| Chapter 6: School Endorsement of Documentation | 15 |
| PURPOSE..... | 15 |
| PROCESS | 15 |
| Chapter 7: The Periodic Programme Review Process | 16 |
| LOCATION OF THE EVENT | 16 |
| THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW PANEL..... | 17 |
| ROLES OF PANEL MEMBERS | 17 |
| THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW PANEL | 17 |
| DOCUMENTATION FOR THE PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW PANEL | 18 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INVOLVEMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL, STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BODY (PSRB)..... | 19 |
| Chapter 8: Outcomes of Periodic Programme Review | 20 |
| Chapter 9: Post-Periodic Programme Review Activity..... | 22 |
| PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW OUTCOMES | 22 |
| RESPONSES TO CONDITIONS AND SIGN-OFF | 22 |
| PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION AND MODULE PROFORMAS | 22 |
| RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 23 |
| PERIODIC PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT AND EVENT COMPLETION FORM..... | 23 |
| FACTFILE | 23 |
| THE CONTRACT | 23 |
| Chapter 10: Changes to the programme between Periodic Programme Reviews | 24 |
| Chapter 11: Institutional Oversight..... | 25 |
| VALIDATION AND REVIEW OVERSIGHT PANEL..... | 25 |
| FACULTY OVERVIEW REPORT | 25 |
| INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW REPORT | 25 |

Glossary

| | |
|---------|---|
| EPA | End Point Assessment |
| FHEQ | Framework for Higher Education Qualifications |
| FQAEC | Faculty Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee |
| ModCat | Module Catalogue |
| NSS | National Student Survey |
| ProdCat | Product Catalogue |
| PSRB | Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Body |
| PTES | Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey |
| QAA | Quality Assurance Agency |
| QAEC | Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee |
| QEO | Quality Enhancement Officer |
| QSO | Quality Support Officer |
| TEF | Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework |
| UKES | United Kingdom Engagement Survey |
| VROP | Validation and Review Oversight Panel |

Chapter 1: Introduction

1. This Guidance is intended to provide information about the Periodic Programme Review process, and the associated roles and responsibilities of all participants, for both internal and collaborative programmes.
2. Periodic Programme Review is the quality assurance process used to scrutinise a validated programme of study in order to assure Academic Board that it continues to meet the University's expectations of standards and quality. Periodic Programme Review is conducted through a process of peer review whereby an informed and impartial panel considers the review of a programme in order to confirm that it continues to meet the required standards, and offers high quality learning opportunities for students. The Periodic Programme Review process provides the programme team(s) with an opportunity to explain the outcomes of the self-evaluation, with the additional benefit of sharing experiences and learning from the wider perspective, and insight, afforded by discussion with University colleagues and external peers.
3. The Periodic Programme Review process is normally conducted via a 'face-to-face' event, however, as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, whilst social distancing measures are necessary, the process will be facilitated using one of the following approaches:
 - Desk-based, via correspondence.
 - A virtual event, via video conferencing software.
 - A hybrid model, utilising a combination of both the desk-based approach and virtual event .
4. The approach selected will be determined by the nature of the programme(s) and the specific circumstances. It is expected that Degree Apprenticeship programmes will adopt the virtual approach to facilitate the involvement of all relevant stakeholders. Regardless of which approach is decided upon, it should be agreed with all relevant stakeholders from the outset.
5. Whichever approach is utilised to conduct the review, should the panel wish to see physical resources as part of their consideration of a programme, this can be facilitated through mechanisms such as photographs and/or videos of applicable resources. In addition, if required/requested, arrangements will be made for the panel to access/view learning resources, i.e. learning materials or recorded taught sessions uploaded to a Virtual Learning Environment.
6. For collaborative programmes undergoing review, discipline-specific resources required for each module, and confirmation of how those resources will be managed, should be outlined in a [Resource Requirements Summary Template](#). Alongside the template, programme teams will also be asked to provide appropriate evidence (such as photographs or short videos) of the necessary resources and equipment in situ.
7. Irrespective of the model of review utilised, an informed and impartial panel, including an external expert(s) and, normally, a student representative, considers the programme(s) in order to confirm that it continues to meet the required standards and offers high quality learning opportunities for students.

8. Development of the University's Periodic Programme Review process has taken account of the Quality Assurance Agency's (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF).
9. The University reserves the right to apply flexibility when operationalising its Periodic Programme Review process, to allow agility where required. When doing so the University adopts a risk-based approach, and ensures continued compliance with relevant national and University policies and requirements. The Head of Quality and Standards must approve all such arrangements in the first instance.

Chapter 2: Periodic Programme Review – initial stages

Timescales for Periodic Programme Review

10. The timescales for Periodic Programme Review can vary greatly. It should be possible to complete the Periodic Programme Review within 3 - 4 months.
11. A successful Periodic Programme Review will result in the ongoing approval of a programme of study. Any proposed changes will only apply to students entering the programme from the next intake date. Normally, it is expected that existing students will complete the extant version of the programme as per the published programme specification. Therefore, the timescales for Periodic Programme Review must provide applicants with sufficient notice of forthcoming changes. Should changes need to be made to extant programmes please see the University's [Guidance for Programme and Module Amendments](#).
12. For **internal provision**, undergraduate programmes must normally be fully reviewed no later than December of the year prior to their intended start date; for postgraduate programmes, with a start date of September, the review process must normally have been completed by May of the year of entry.
13. For **collaborative provision**, timescales will be developed to meet the business needs of each individual programme.

Initiating Periodic Programme Review

14. Academic Registry manages the University's schedule of Periodic Programme Review. Programmes that are approved following Periodic Programme Review are normally approved for a period of 5 years, and the next Periodic Programme Review date is recorded on WebHub. Programme teams will be notified that a programme is due for review in the year preceding the review year.
15. For **internal provision**, Periodic Programme Review will normally take place in subject clusters rather than on a programme-by-programme basis. The composition of subject clusters will be agreed by Academic Registry in conjunction with Directors of School.
16. It is acknowledged that on occasion it may be necessary for programmes to undergo review outside of their assigned subject cluster, for example due to Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements, significant developments within the discipline, or for strategic reasons. In these circumstances, the Director of School is permitted to request a stand-alone review for an individual programme, which is known as "Elective Programme Review". To avoid subject-clusters becoming fragmented through the use of Elective Programme Reviews, in instances where a programme undergoes Elective Programme Review, the next date of review will be aligned to the date when their allocated subject cluster is next scheduled for review. The extent to which these programmes are considered as part of the review of their assigned subject cluster, will be determined by when the Elective Programme Review took place in relation to the review of the subject cluster.
17. In exceptional circumstances an extension to a programme approval period can be granted, normally for a maximum of one year only. The rationale for requesting an extension should be presented to the Validation and Review Oversight Panel (VROP) on the agreed [template](#). In considering the application, VROP will ensure that all appropriate quality assurance materials, such as External Examiner reports, have been submitted and

are appropriate before approving an extension. Applications for an extension must be endorsed by the relevant Director of School prior to submission to the Secretary of VROP.

Chapter 3: The Periodic Programme Review Planning Process

18. Arrangements for the Periodic Programme Review will normally be agreed virtually in conjunction with the programme team and Director of School. Once agreed, the Event Officer will confirm in writing the agreed approach to conducting the review, the timeline of activity and documentary requirements, and will also provide the applicable templates. The timeline of activity will also be provided to the relevant Faculty Registrar, Library Services representative and the Faculty Marketing Manager and, for collaborative provision, the International Partnerships Manager (where relevant) for information.
19. In certain instances it may be necessary to schedule a planning meeting¹ to agree arrangements for the Periodic Programme Review. For example, if:
- The review requires PSRB involvement.
 - The Periodic Programme Review process involves a Programme Leader/partner with no prior experience of the University's Periodic Programme Review process.
 - The Programme Leader/partner/programme team/School request a planning meeting.
20. For **collaborative programmes**, where a planning meeting is facilitated, the meeting must include partner staff, and will not proceed without partner staff involvement².

¹ Whilst social distancing measures are necessary, these meetings will take place virtually.

² For meetings, which take place 'face-to-face', the attendance of partner staff can be facilitated via video conferencing.

Chapter 4: Periodic Programme Review Documentation

21. The University's core Periodic Programme Review submission comprises:

- Self-Evaluation Document.
- Programme specification(s) (PDF version(s) taken from ProdCat).
- Module proformas (PDF versions taken from ModCat).
- CVs for relevant University and partner institution staff, as appropriate.

22. If applicable to the programme(s), and/or model of review, the following should also be provided by the programme team(s) alongside the core Periodic Programme Review submission:

- Off-site delivery approval template (if applicable).
- Approved application for variance (if applicable).
- Factfile (for Periodic Programme Review events with PSRB involvement only).
- Programme support materials (Distance Learning programmes only).
- Draft Practice Assessment Records (Degree Apprenticeships only).
- Learning Journey Plan (Degree Apprenticeships only).
- Guidance materials for work-based mentors (Degree Apprenticeships only).
- The Commitment Statement (Degree Apprenticeships only).
- Mapping updates against a named Articulated Progression Route (Foundation Degrees only).
- Resource Requirements Summary Template (collaborative programmes only).

23. Programme teams should consult the following evidence for the Periodic Programme Review:

- Programme Document/Design and Delivery Overview from validation.
- Self-Evaluation Documents from previous Periodic Programme Reviews.
- Programme Performance Summary Reports and related Enhancement and Development Plans for the Periodic Programme Review period:
 - Progression.
 - Completion on time.
 - Achievement.
 - Module Performance.
 - Student survey outcomes.
- External Examiners' reports and responses.
- History of programme amendments.
- Subject Benchmark Statements.
- PSRB reports and requirements.

Self Evaluation Document

24. The Self-Evaluation Document must be completed using the standard template. It provides information for the panel about the ongoing management of the programme. It should be a reflective, critical, evidence-based appraisal of the programme's operation since it was initially validated or last underwent review.

25. The Self-Evaluation Document will consider the following themes:

- Admissions, retention and success.

- Curricula and programme structure.
 - Teaching, learning and assessment.
 - Student support mechanisms.
 - Staffing and resource requirements.
 - Programme management and quality assurance.
26. The development of the self-evaluation should be a collegial exercise. Programme team members should be fully engaged in the review process, sharing the preparation and analysis.
27. It is expected that the self-evaluation will be informed by consultation activities with students, External Examiners and other stakeholders, for example, employers. The University's professional service teams may also be consulted regarding specific aspects of the evaluation, for example, the Teaching and Learning Academy, Marketing, and Student Recruitment and Admissions.
28. For **Articulation Arrangements** the Self-Evaluation Document should include consideration of the ongoing comparability of the programmes and the experience of students who enter the programme via this route.

Programme Specification

29. An updated programme specification(s) should be submitted as part of the documentation for the Periodic Programme Review. This will apply to students entering the programme from the next intake date. Normally, existing students will complete the extant version of the programme(s) as per the published programme specification(s).
30. The programme specification is a definitive record of a programme and can be accessed by a range of stakeholders, including prospective and current students, employers, External Examiners and PSRBs. The programme specification(s) will be reviewed and approved as part of the Periodic Programme Review process. Any programme specification updates should reflect outcomes that are documented in the Self-Evaluation Document.
31. A standard format is used across the University for all programme specifications. Development of programme specifications is undertaken via ProdCat.
32. For **Franchise programmes** the programme specification will generally match the specification for the home programme, but should include some specific details related to delivery by the partner.

Module Proformas

33. Updated module proformas for all modules should be submitted as part of the core Periodic Programme Review submission. These will apply to students entering the programme from the next intake date. Any module updates should reflect outcomes that are documented in the Self-Evaluation Document.
34. Existing students will complete the extant version of the programme as per existing module proformas.

Staff CVs

35. Staff CVs should normally be provided on the agreed University template and submitted as a PDF file. CVs should not contain personal details such as dates of birth, home phone numbers/addresses etc. The Self-Evaluation Document should highlight, through consideration of ongoing resources, any changes to the programme staff profile.

Chapter 5: Student Engagement in the Periodic Programme Review Process

36. Student consultation and engagement will take different forms during the Periodic Programme Review process as follows:

- By seeking students' views in order to inform the self-evaluation.
- By identifying a small group of students to meet/engage with the panel during the Periodic Programme Review process.
- By appointing a student to act as a full member of the review panel. .

Student input during development of the Self-Evaluation

37. The student perspective should be used to inform the evaluation of a programme(s) and their input should be sought early in the Periodic Programme Review process. The University has a number of formal mechanisms in place to seek student feedback, for example the National Student Survey (NSS), the UK Engagment Survey (UKES), the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), Liverpool John Moores University module appraisal, programme Boards of Study and Staff/Student Liaison Committees. The outcomes of these mechanisms will form part of the evidence base to inform the self-evaluation. In addition, programme teams should consider further means of involving students in developing and refining the self-evaluation and associated proposed changes, for example focus groups.

38. It is acknowledged that **collaborative partners** will have their own mechanisms to receive feedback from students and these should be used during the review process.

39. The focus of student engagement will be concerned with requesting input from current students and, where possible, alumni, especially those who are employed in related areas. The development of the self-evaluation should prompt specific lines of enquiry. However, students should also be encouraged to provide less directed feedback. Possible questions could include, but are not limited to:

- What is good about the programme(s)?
- Do they think the balance between different aspects of the programme(s) is appropriate?
- Are there any particular topics/subject areas that students would expect to see incorporated within the programme(s) not currently covered by the modules?
- Are there any modules where it is not clear how these contribute to the programme(s)?
- Are there any skills not included that they would expect to see on a programme in this subject discipline?
- What do they think about the assessment types and loading/balance on the programme(s) and the opportunities for formative and summative feedback?
- How well do they think the programme(s) prepares students for the job market?
- Have the programme team(s) addressed student feedback?
- In what ways do they think that students contribute to the programme and its development?

40. Programme teams should outline the activities and outcomes of the student engagement stage in the Self-Evaluation Document.

41. Engagement with students is only one dimension of the process and should be considered in the context of interactions with the teaching team, External Examiners and other relevant stakeholders (employers, PSRBs etc).

Student involvement at the Periodic Programme Review event or via the desk-based/hybrid model of review

42. If the review is to be conducted via a 'face-to-face', virtual or hybrid event, then the meeting with students is a private meeting with the panel, so members of the programme team(s) cannot be present. Comments made by students during the meeting will not be attributed to any individuals. Usually the panel would like to meet between 5-10 students from a variety of levels/modes of study (where applicable). Discussions in this meeting give the panel an opportunity to gain the perspective of students, and may also provide an opportunity to triangulate with the discussions in the meetings with programme teams and senior management. Whilst it is desirable to include a meeting with students, the review event may go ahead in the absence of a student meeting if it has not been possible to secure student attendance, and evidence of student engagement, during the review phase, has been received by the Periodic Programme Review panel.
43. The panel will ask students questions about a wide range of areas, including their views on admission, induction, the learning experience, student support, the quality and usefulness of programme documents, assessment, feedback on work, opportunities for students to provide feedback and how it is responded to, the accessibility of the curriculum for all students, and the availability and quality of learning resources and study space. Students will also be given the opportunity to raise and discuss other issues that they believe are relevant to the review process.
44. If the review process is conducted as a desk-based activity, as part of their feedback, panel members are asked to identify, as applicable, questions for which a response from students is required. Should questions of this nature be raised, it is the responsibility of programme teams to obtain these responses. However, to support programme teams in undertaking this task, they are also permitted to confirm to the Event Officer a sample of students who would be willing to be contacted as part of the process. In these instances, the Event Officer would then liaise with the identified students in order to obtain responses to the panel's questions.
45. It is the programme teams' responsibility to secure students to participate in the process of review and to ensure their engagement.

Appointing a student to act as a full panel member

46. The applicable programme team or partner will be asked to identify a student to join the review panel as a full member. This student may be a programme representative or an Academic Interest Representative from a cognate area, but should not normally be affiliated to the programme area under consideration. In-line with other panel members, they will be provided with the review documentation by the Event Officer. Their role is to offer a student perspective on the programme(s) and to assist the panel in identifying lines of enquiry that may directly impact on the student experience. The Chair and Event Officer will brief the student panel member at the start of the process, and support them during the course of the process, to ensure their input is managed appropriately.

Chapter 6: School Endorsement of Documentation

Purpose

47. The School endorsement stage is a critical review of the draft Periodic Programme Review submission. The purpose of this stage of the process is to ensure the appropriateness of the submission prior to it being received by the Periodic Programme Review panel.

Process

48. Under the direction of the relevant Director of School³, arrangements will be put in place to review and endorse the draft Periodic Programme Review submission, at School -level, to proceed to the Institutional Periodic Programme Review. Specifically how this review is operationalised is at the discretion of each Director of School⁴, but timescales for this activity must be determined by the agreed date the finalised documents are required to be submitted to the Event Officer.

49. The relevant Director of School⁵ will identify who will undertake the review of the documentation within the School. To facilitate this review, the final draft of all required review documentation should be submitted electronically to the identified School reviewer(s) and the Faculty Registrar, by the agreed deadline.

50. School endorsement confirms that:

- The documentation has been fully edited for typographical errors, and to ensure uniformity and consistency in presentation and style.
- The proposal is in line with the expectations of the School.
- The submission is complete, accurate and the correct templates have been utilised.
- The submission is aligned with the relevant University regulations and policies.
- The Faculty Registrar has been engaged in the review and sign-off of the submission.

51. The Director of School⁶, will complete a declaration, utilising the agreed [template](#), confirming that the submission has been reviewed, and is appropriate to proceed to the Institutional Periodic Programme Review. The completed School declaration must be supplied to the Event Officer alongside the review documentation.

52. Following completion of the School endorsement stage, programme teams will provide the Event Officer with an electronic copy of the full Periodic Programme Review submission (normally via email), including the completed School declaration.

³ For collaborative programmes this must be the Liverpool John Moores University Director of School.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

Chapter 7: The Periodic Programme Review Process

53. The University normally manages its Periodic Programme Review activity through a summative 'face-to-face' event. However, as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, whilst social distancing measures are necessary, the review process will be facilitated using one of the approaches outlined in paragraph 3. Regardless of the model of review utilised, appropriate opportunities are facilitated for collegiate engagement, regarding the programme(s), between the programme team, senior management from the School(s), partner⁷, students, employers⁸, PSRB⁹, and a panel of academic peers. To do this, the panel reviews the Periodic Programme Review submission, and provides advanced comments to the Event Officer. For event-based validations¹⁰, advanced comments will be collated by the Event Officer, and will be used to inform the agenda for the meeting. Comments will be shared with the programme team, in advance of the review event, in order to promote transparency and aid preparation.
54. The desk-based correspondence model mitigates against the lack of face-to-face discussions, and ensures the rigour of the process is not affected, by using enhanced paperwork, which has been developed to facilitate clear and robust dialogue between the review panel and the programme team, and vice versa. All panel members are required to comment on a range of themes, including the programme's alignment with the University's and national expectations of standards and quality, alignment to appropriate University policies and external frameworks/benchmarks, the quality and appropriateness of students' learning opportunities, and identified features of innovative/good practice.

Location of the event

55. 'Face-to-face' events will normally take place at the campus where the programme(s) is delivered. If the programme team(s) feel there is a reason to hold the event at an alternative venue, this should be discussed with the Event Officer at the planning stage. Due to the impact of COVID-19 it is anticipated that 'face-to-face' events will not be possible during academic year 2020-21. Consequently, event-based Periodic Programme Reviews will be facilitated via the virtual or hybrid methodologies, utilising video conferencing software.
56. For **collaborative programmes**, there may be instances where the situation is more complex or there are changes after Periodic Programme Review, for example:
- The programme will be delivered over a number of different sites.
 - The partner institution wish to expand delivery from one site to an additional site(s).
 - The partner institution is moving its base from one site to a different site.

In these instances, the University will wish to consider the site(s) of delivery before teaching of the University's programme commences there. The [Additional or New Site process](#) should be used to establish the site approval mechanism, using a risk-based approach.

57. When an existing programme(s) reaches the end of its approval period and requires Periodic Programme Review, consideration should be given to the number of sites where

⁷ As applicable.

⁸ For Degree Apprenticeships only, the validation panel are required to meet with employers.

⁹ As applicable.

¹⁰ 'Face-to-face, virtual and hybrid events.

the programme(s) is being delivered and the approval mechanism to continue approval of all required sites. .

58. If a programme(s) is moving from an existing site to a new site, the site approval activity should always be completed before teaching at the new site begins.

The Periodic Programme Review panel

59. Periodic Programme Review panels will be secured by Academic Registry, with the exception of external and student panel members, who should be nominated by the programme team(s). With the exception of the student panel member, all panel members will normally hold academic positions. The University's Periodic Programme Review panels have the delegated authority to make decisions regarding the ongoing approval of programmes on behalf of Academic Board.

60. A Periodic Programme Review panel should normally comprise:

- Chair from a different School than the programme(s) under consideration.
- One University representative from a different School than the programme(s) under consideration.
- One student representative.
- One external panel member (a second external can be nominated depending on the size, complexity or level of expertise required for the programme(s) under consideration, for example to ensure appropriate practice expertise is represented where the panel is considering a Degree Apprenticeship).
- One Event Officer.

61. All University staff panel members will be invited to a briefing session organised by Academic Registry. This briefing session will run annually as an introduction for those that are new to the Periodic Programme Review process. Existing panel members will also be invited to share experience, and for their own updating. Academic Registry will maintain a record of all staff who have attended a briefing session.

Roles of panel members

62. Information on the role of each panel member can be found [here](#).

The responsibilities of the Periodic Programme Review panel

63. Periodic Programme Review panels are responsible for:

- Ensuring that appropriate evidence has been used to evaluate the programme(s) and to inform the Periodic Programme Review process.
- Considering the effectiveness of methods used to evaluate the programme(s).
- Ensuring that programme teams have completed a thorough self-evaluation.
- Ensuring that the conclusions of the self-evaluation are appropriately addressed through proposed amendments.
- Assessing that the programme(s) continues to meet the University's expectations of standards and quality.
- Ensuring that students are provided with appropriate learning opportunities to achieve the intended learning outcomes.
- Ensuring that the programme(s) remains in line with national expectations and benchmarks.

- Exploring issues relating to the development of the discipline, the ongoing validity and appropriateness of the structure and content of the programme(s).
- Ensuring adherence to University policies.
- Identifying evidence of good practice in the Self-Evaluation Document that is worthy of dissemination and recommending methods of dissemination.
- Ensuring that the programme(s) is effectively managed and is appropriately aligned to applicable external requirements and reference points, for example the FHEQ.
- Ensuring that resources and staffing remain adequate to deliver the programme(s).

64. In addition, for **Degree Apprenticeships only**, the Periodic Programme Review panel will be responsible for:

- Ensuring that the programme, including the training provision, constitutes an appropriate preparation to enable apprentices to meet the nationally approved Apprenticeship Standard of occupational competence.
- Ensuring the 'behaviours' required as an outcome of an apprenticeship are reflected in the programme and module learning outcomes.
- Ensuring that there are clear arrangements for how the apprentice will be supported in the workplace to develop the duties, knowledge, skills and behaviours specified in the Apprenticeship Standard.
- Considering how the University will work with employers to ensure that the working environment, within which apprentices are operating, is appropriate to enable them to develop the required duties, knowledge, skills and behaviours for the relevant Apprenticeship Standard.
- Ensuring that the University meets the requirements of the relevant Assessment Plan in demonstrating independence of the process for End Point Assessment (if it is an integrated Degree Apprenticeship).

Documentation for the Periodic Programme Review panel

65. Academic Registry, will prepare the information for the Periodic Programme Review panel. It will comprise a briefing pack and the documentation set out in Chapter 4.

66. The briefing pack will contain:

- The itinerary for the review event¹¹ and a list of panel members.
- Briefing paper (for collaborative events and events involving a PSRB only).
- Advanced comments template for panel members.
- Guidance for Periodic Programme Review 2020-21.
- Completed School declaration.
- Fee/expense claim form (external panel members only).

67. Periodic Programme Review panels may also request access to the evidence base used by the programme team(s) to develop the Self-Evaluation Document.

68. The programme team(s), Director of School will receive details of the agenda for the day¹² and details of panel membership from the Event Officer. For programmes that include cross-School or Faculty staff, the Programme Leader should ensure representation from all areas.

¹¹ Event-based Periodic Programme Reviews only ('face-to-face', virtual or hybrid).

¹² Ibid.

Involvement of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB)

69. Professional body input to the Periodic Programme Review event will have been discussed and identified at the planning stage and appropriate action taken to ensure the correct involvement of the PSRBs in the Periodic Programme Review process. For further information on engaging with PSRBs, during the Periodic Programme Review process, please see the University's [Guidance for Engagement with PSRBs](#).

Periodic Programme Review Using Shared Modules

70. The panel will be advised by the Event Officer of any modules that are shared across other validated programmes. Should the panel identify any actions for consideration by the team that affect these modules, and these actions are more fundamental than simple typographical corrections, then these should normally be expressed within the outcomes as recommendations rather than conditions of approval. This provides an opportunity for all affected programmes to consider the recommendation and discuss the most appropriate response. This may, or may not, lead to the module(s) in question being updated for all programmes they contribute to, using the University's process for programme and module amendments (as described in Chapter 10).

Chapter 8: Outcomes of Periodic Programme Review

71. For event-based Periodic Programme Reviews, the panel will formulate its decision and the Chair will communicate this to the programme team(s) at the end of the event. This will include a summary of any conditions and associated deadlines, recommendations and identified good practice. The standard period of ongoing approval that the panel can agree is five years.

72. For a Periodic Programme Review conducted by correspondence, panel members are required to identify specific questions that they wish to explore with the programme team in order to make a decision on re-approval. The totality of this feedback is shared with the Chair for consideration in advance of it being shared with the programme team. The questions to be explored with the programme team are then collated into a single template by the Event Officer. The template contains provision for:

- The programme team to provide a response to each of the panel's questions.
- Panel members to confirm their satisfaction with each of the programme team's responses.
- Panel members to confirm their view on whether the programme should be re-approved, and whether re-approval should be subject to conditions.
- Once the final outcomes have been shared with the programme team, the agreed post-event activities are undertaken in line with the guidance provided in Chapter 9.

73. There are three possible outcomes of review:

- Periodic Programme Review meets requirements - ongoing approval, with/without conditions and/or recommendations for five years.
- Periodic Programme Review meets requirements - ongoing approval for a fixed period less than five years, with detailed reasons; with/without conditions and/or recommendations.
- Periodic Programme Review does not meet requirements - rejection, with detailed reasons and closure process initiated.

74. A positive approval decision confirms that:

- The threshold academic standards of the programme(s) are consistent with the relevant national qualifications framework, and the programme(s) will provide students with the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level.
- The value of qualifications awarded to students is in line with sector-recognised standards.
- Where applicable, the programme(s) aligns with relevant subject benchmark statements, PSRB requirements and degree level Apprenticeship Standards.
- The programme(s) is current and valid in light of developing knowledge in the discipline and developments in teaching and learning. It/they will provide a high quality academic experience for all students and enable students' achievements to be reliably assessed.
- The programme(s) has been designed in line with the University's Academic Framework Regulations and relevant University policies. Where applicable, any variances to the Academic Framework have been clearly articulated and these have been approved according to University procedures.
- The programme(s) contains appropriate assessment opportunities for students to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes for the award(s).

- There is sufficient and appropriate facilities, learning resources, student support services and appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.
75. Any conditions arising from Periodic Programme Review will be detailed points of action that must be fulfilled satisfactorily by an agreed date. The panel and the Chair will agree how responses to conditions will be considered, whether by the whole panel or by approval of the Chair only.
 76. Any recommendations are not requirements, but should be suggestions that the panel believe would improve the programme(s).
 77. Commendations should relate to identified features of good and/or innovative practice emerging from the panel's consideration of the documentation and the discussions with the programme team(s).
 78. Panel members and the programme team(s) will be asked to provide feedback after the Periodic Programme Review process has concluded, in order to identify any issues and any good practice arising from the process. This evaluation will normally be managed by the Event Officer.

Chapter 9: Post-Periodic Programme Review Activity

79. Post-review sign off will be co-ordinated between the Event Officer, the Chair of the panel and the Faculty Registrar. The Event Officer will liaise with the panel Chair and confirm to the Faculty Registrar when any conditions of Periodic Programme Review have been signed off.

Periodic Programme Review outcomes

80. The outcomes of the Periodic Programme Review process will normally be written immediately by the Event Officer for approval by the Chair and/or full panel, and sent to the programme team(s) for completion of any necessary action(s).
81. The Periodic Programme Review report will be circulated to the panel for approval and final sign-off will be confirmed by the Chair to the Event Officer. Once approved by the panel, the event report will then be sent to the programme team(s), Director of School, Head of Operations, Faculty Registrar and filed electronically by Academic Registry.

Responses to conditions and sign-off

82. All responses to conditions should be returned to the Event Officer, by the programme team(s), who will ensure they are considered through the process agreed by the panel. If further action is identified, this will be relayed to the programme team(s) with a new timescale for production of the additional information. If a response to the conditions is not received by the relevant deadline, this will be reported to the University's Validation and Review Oversight Panel (VROP) for consideration. Failure to comply with conditions means that the programme details are not updated on the student database and that the programme(s) is not in approval and cannot run or have new students enrolled on it.
83. In exceptional circumstances, in the absence of the Chair, the response to the conditions can be approved by the Academic Registrar. Where there are discipline specific elements to the conditions, approval by the Academic Registrar will be subject to confirmation from the external panel member(s) that the applicable conditions have been addressed appropriately.

Programme Specification and Module Proformas

84. Following confirmation that any identified conditions have been addressed appropriately, the applicable module proformas and programme specification(s) should be submitted for approval, via ModCat and ProdCat. For **collaborative programmes** submission of the programme specification(s) and module proformas will be facilitated by the applicable Liverpool John Moores University School on behalf of the partner. Approval of the module proformas and programme specification(s), within ModCat and ProdCat, is undertaken by the relevant Faculty Registrar.
85. Publication of the programme specification(s) on ProdCat will be confirmed by Academic Registry.
86. Once the new programme specification(s) has been published by Academic Registry, the Admissions Team or partner is able to make offers to applicants.

Responses to recommendations

87. Recommendations are not requirements, but they are suggestions that may necessitate action by the programme team(s). After the new iteration of programme(s) has operated for a full year, it is expected that programme teams address recommendations through the Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement process (please refer to the [Guidance for Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement](#) for further details). It is expected that the programme team(s) will indicate how the recommendations have been considered and whether (or not) any action is being taken to incorporate them in the programme(s).

Production of definitive documentation

88. One of the outcomes of the Periodic Programme Review process will be the production of definitive documentation and this will include all the documentation considered by the panel in forming its conclusions.

89. For **internal programmes**, the definitive documentation will be compiled by the Event Officer.

90. For **collaborative programmes**, the programme team(s) should provide the Event Officer with a complete set of definitive documentation, electronically, by the date specified in the event report.

91. The definitive documentation will be stored by Academic Registry.

Periodic Programme Review Report and Event Completion Form

92. In order to confirm completion of the Periodic Programme Review process, post-review activity will be summarised and reported to VROP via receipt of the Periodic Programme Review report (or Event Completion Form for collaborative programmes), which is completed by the Event Officer. The Periodic Programme Review report/Event Completion Form will include confirmation of technical sign-off in respect of the module proformas and programme specification(s). The Periodic Programme Review report is regarded as the formal record of the process, and it will be filed by the Event Officer alongside the definitive documentation.

93. Academic Registry will update the University's validation WebHub tool with the date of re-approval and the next Periodic Programme Review date.

94. For **collaborative programmes**, the Event Completion Form will be sent to the programme team(s), Faculty Head of Operations, Faculty Registrar, Director of School and International Partnerships Manager (where appropriate).

Factfile

95. The Factfile will be updated, post-review, by the Faculty Marketing Manager and programme team(s) utilising the programme information contained within the definitive programme documentation, which will be made available by Academic Registry.

The Contract

96. For **collaborative programmes**, the contract with the partner institution will only be signed once the Event Completion Form has been signed off.

Chapter 10: Changes to the programme between Periodic Programme Reviews

97. Any subsequent changes required to the programme between Periodic Programme Reviews, will require approval by the appropriate University/Faculty committee (please see [Guidance for Programme and Module Amendments](#) for a summary of the procedure for making changes).
98. For **articulation agreements**, if a change is made to the partner or home award between Periodic Programme Reviews, this will require consideration through the appropriate Faculty Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (FQAEC), to confirm whether the changes impact on the appropriateness of the articulation/recognition agreement. The Quality Enhancement Officer (QEO)/Quality Support Officer (QSO)/Collaborative Provision Team will advise if a re-mapping is required as part of the approval.
99. For **franchise programmes**, when the internal University Periodic Programme Review takes place, mid-approval cycle, for the partner programme, the Collaborative Provision Team will be informed by the QEO/QSO of any changes made to the programme, and will evaluate what quality assurance activity needs to take place with the partner institution to ensure that they can continue to run the programme.

Chapter 11: Institutional Oversight

Validation and Review Oversight Panel

100. A copy of the Periodic Programme Review report/Event Completion Form should be circulated to VROP as soon as possible after it has been confirmed for audit and monitoring purposes. The panel is a sub-group of the University's Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC), is chaired by the Head of Quality and Standards, and normally meets three times per year in order to monitor validation and Periodic Programme Review activity across the University and its collaborative partners. Its terms of reference can be found [here](#).

Faculty Overview Report

101. At the end of each academic year, the QEO/QSO will produce a Faculty overview report of the Periodic Programme Reviews that have taken place in the Faculty that year. FQAEC will receive the report for information and discussion.

Institutional Overview Report

102. The Head of Quality and Standards will produce an institutional overview report of validation and review activity, which will bring together the individual Faculty-level reports (following FQAEC consideration), along with key issues and recommendations arising from VROP's scrutiny of validation and review activity. This institutional report will be considered by VROP before being forwarded to QAEC and Academic Board.